UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,039	02/14/2006	Takashi Hirokawa	20241/0207052-US0	7330
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 08/29/200 RBY P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 770	- 4-4*	CHUI, MEI PING		
Church Street S New York, NY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
HIROKAWA ET AL.	
Art Unit	
1616	
	HIROKAWA ET AL. Art Unit

	MEI-PING CHUI	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi real (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	•	36(a) and the appropriate	e extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2.	liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beto 		ducina or cimplifyina th	oo issues for
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- (1) The receipt of Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 filed on 07/30/2008 is acknowledged. The Declaration has been recorded in the file, but it is not entered due to the reason set forth above (see Item No. 8).
- (2) The Examiner thanks Applicants' for pointing out the typographical error in the Office Action Summary (Form PTO-326), section 12(b)). Accordingly, the Office Action Summary and BIB Data Sheet have been corrected and recorded in the file.
- (3) Applicants argue the prior art of record do not teach that the agricultural granules have significant improved water disintegrability and water dispersibility as opposed to the instant invention, which agricultural granules have significantly improved disintegrability and water dispersibility; therefore, the instantly claimed agricultural granules would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art based on the teachings and disclosures of the prior art of record.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the features upon which applicants rely (improved water disintegrability and water dispersibility) is not recited in the rejected claim 1. Although the claim is interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claim(s). See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the prior rejection(s) under U.S.C. 103(a) of record remain valid and will be maintained for the reason of record.